HP Turbine Dens Operating Options and Econo

		gas					*******
		Unit Operation			Econ	omics	
			Station Net	Station Fuel			
		Station Max	Heat Rate	Consumption	Total Capital	Benefit Per	Pa
Option	Description	Gross Load	(BTU/KWH)	(Tons/Year)	Cost	Year	Perio
							Ī
		4750 4 844	0500	E 000 040			
4	Current Operation	1750 MW	9500	5,268,249	NA NA	NA NA	
1	Maintain the same historical maximum load	1					
	with improved heat rate.						1
		Same	-214	-118,536	\$9,400,000	\$4,267,282	
2	Maintain the same historical steam flow and						
	increase turbine/generator output. (Note 6)	1 7					1
			1 47	\\			
		L }	ľ				
		40 MW	-214	Same	\$9,600,000	\$15,137,280	
3	Install additional plant improvements to						
	increase boiler and other systems capacity.						
	Install moderate NOx reduction equipment						
	(Note 7).	100 MW	-214	310,224	\$36,400,000	\$35,784,705	
				1	****	3	
tem	General Assumptions	24.		Analysis fo	or Option 1		
	Present Value Annuity Factor (P/A, 6.35 %, 20			y Increase (guara	anteed by	2.25%	Benefit
1	years):	11.2	supplier) =				Hrs.) (0
	Hours of equivalent operation/year (8760X 0.9			Reduction = Pro	portional to	2.25%	Paybac
2	Cap. Factor):	7884	Turbine Efficience		/0500	0.1.4	/Benefi
0	0 (- 5 - 5 1 / 6 / 7)	¢20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			1	Benefit
3	Cost of Fuel (\$/Ton):	\$30	BTU/KWH) =BTU	Э/КWН (Heat Rate Reduc	ntion\/Ctotion	118,536	Annuity
4	Cost of replacement energy (\$/MWH)	7\$48	Not Lood (Fauly	Hrs)/(Coal BTU/L	5001)(Station	110,530	
	Avoided maintenance cost for the station		Lbs/Ton) = (Tons	i iis)/(Coai DTO/L	.0)(2000		
5	(Note 1):	\$5,304,000	(101)	?)			
			Benefit per Year	= (Reduced Fuel	(Cost of Fuel) =	\$4,267,282	Benefit
6	High pressure turbine section retrofit:	\$9,400,000		,	, ,		Hrs.) (0
eggenerate PMM-Management pa	Cost of additional plant improvements		Payback Period	= (Capital Costs -	Avoided Costs)		Cost/Ye
7	(Note 2):	\$12,000,000	/Benefit per Year	= Years			
	Cost of moderate NOx control equipment			tatio = (Benefit pe		11.67	Paybac
88	(SNCR):	\$15,000,000	Ahnuity Factor)/(Capital Costs - A	voided Costs) =		Costs)
9	Operating cost per year for SNCR (Note 4):	\$2.0E0.40E				12	Benefit
J	Operating cost per year for Sivok (Note 4):	\$2,058,495					Annuity
10	Cool (PTI I/I P)	44 000					Increas
10	Coal (BTU/LB) Urea (SNCR Reagent) Utilization per Ton NOx	11,800	\				Rate)(li
11	removed (Tons)	1					BTU/Lb
						Ţ	
12	Cost of Urea per Ton (Note 3)	\$300					



HP Turbine Dense Pack Modifications Operating Options and Economic and Environmental Analysis

Unit Operation			Economics				Environmer		
	Station Net	Station Fuel					NOx	SO2 Emissions	-
tion Max	Heat Rate	Consumption	Total Capital	Benefit Per	Payback	Benefit/Cost	Emissions per	.	
ss Load	(BTU/KWH)	(Tons/Year)	Cost	Year	Period (Years)	Ratio	Year (Tons)	(Tons)	Er
750 1011	0500	T 000 040	NIA	210	NA	NA	20400	0004	Current I Ibs/MBTI SO2. Bo
750 MW	9500	5,268,249	NA	NA NA	NA	NA NA	26109	2984	basis.
									Operatin trigger a Preventic (PSD) re
Same	-214	-118,536	\$9,400,000	\$4,267,282	0.96	11.67	-587	-67	year wou
		$\langle \Rightarrow \rangle$					$\langle - \rangle$	$\langle \rightarrow \rangle$	Since the not chan mandate difficult to
40 MW	-214	Same	\$9,600,000	\$15,137,280	0.28	39.46	Same	Same	year natı
									Permitting not be dif 0.46 LBS more agg
100 MW	-214	310,224	\$36,400,000	\$35,784,705	0.87	£.89	-6362	-680	not be ma
						341 15	100		
	Turbino Efficienc	Analysis fo y Increase (guara		2 250	Benefit per Year	Analysis fo		\$15,137,280	Note 1
	supplier) =	y morease (guara	inteed by		Hrs.) (Cost of Re			\$10,107,200	section
	Boiler Heat Input	Reduction = Pro	portional to		Payback Period =			0.28	0000011
	Turbine Efficienc				/Benefit per Year	= Years			
		eduction = 2.25%	(9500		Benefit to Cost R			39.46	Note 2 -
\$30	\$36 BTU/KWH) =BTU/KWH Reduced Fuel = (Heat Rate Reduction)(Station			.118,536	Annuity Factor)/(Capital Costs - A	voided Costs) =		capacity towers,
\$48	Net Load)(Equiv.	.Hrs)/(Coal BTU/L	.b)(2000	, , , , , , ,					tovvers,
\$5,304,000	Lbs/Ton) = (Tons	5)				Analysis fo	r Option 3		Note 3 -
	Benefit per Year	= (Reduced Fuel	(Cost of Fuel) =		Benefit per Year	= (Increased Ger	eration)(Equiv.	\$35,784,705	
\$9,400,000					Hrs.) (Cost of Re	placement Energ	y) - Operating		
\$12,000,000	⊮ayback Period : /Benefit per Year	= (Capital Costs - r = Years	Avoided Costs)	0.96	Cost/Year = \$				Note 4 -
	Benefit to Cost Ratio = (Benefit per Year)(PV O Ahnuity Factor)/(Capital Costs - Avoided Costs) =				67 Payback Period = (Capital Costs - Avoided 0.8 Costs) /Benefit per Year = Years			0.87	
\$2,058,495		ouplier outle 11			Benefit to Cost R	atio = (Benefit pe			Note 5 -
\$2,000,490					Annuity Factor)/(c			310,224	remova
11,800					Rate)(Increased I			310,224	wans m
	\				BTU/Lb)(2000 Lb				Note 6
1		*							and iso
\$300									
	ı					,			Note 7
								i	Selectiv
									such as
								Ĺ	

ack Modifications and Environmental Analysis

ERROR SERVICE SERVICE			En	vironmental				
		NOx	SO2 Emissions					
:k	Benefit/Cost	Emissions per	per Year	Maria				
ars)	Ratio	Year (Tons)	(Tons)	Environmental Assessment	Comments			
	NA	26109	298 4	Current Emissions limits are 0.5 lbs/MBTU of NOx and 0.15 Lbs/MBTU of SO2. Both on rolling 30 day average basis.	Current NOx emissions rate is 0.42 lbs/MBTU and SO2 is 0.048 lbs/MBTU			
0.96	11.67	-587	-67	Operating in this manner should not trigger a New Source Review (NSR) or Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) review. Variations from year to year would have to be explained.	There should be no change in NOx and SO2 emissions rate. Total tons per year reductions are from decreased coal burn.			
0.28	39.46	Same		Since the NOx and SO2 emissions should not change, increasing load should not mandate a NSR or PSD review. May be difficult to prove as it varies from year to	There should be no change in NOx and SO2 emissions rate.			
0.87	€.89) -6362	~		Assumes NOx emissions will decrease to 0.3 Lbs/MBTU and SO2 emissions will decrease to 0.035 Lbs/MBTU (See Note 5)			
	-			ica i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i				
of Reprised =	Analysis for the control of the cont	eration)(Equiv. y) = \$	1	Notes Note 1 - Avoided maintenance cost equals the normal overhaul cost for the turbine HP section plus the avoided outage extension of 3 days to refurbish the HP nozzle block.				
Year = Years ost Ratio = (Benefit per Year)(PV tor)/(Capital Costs - Avoided Costs) =				Note 2 - Cost of additional plant improvements are the projects necessary to increase the capacity of all other plant systems to handle the increased load. This includes the cooling towers, main transformer, generator cooling and other systems.				
Analysis for Option 3 /ear = (Increased Generation)(Equiv. \$35,784,7 of Replacement Energy) - Operating				Note 3 - Cost of Urea is based on \$0.75 per gallon for a 50% liquid solution.				
\$	(Capital Costs -		0.87	Note 4 - Operating cost for SNCR includes 1% of the capital cost per year for Maintenance.				
efit pe	Year = Years		0.07					
ost Ra	itio = (Benefit per			Note 5 - SO2 emissions will decrease by installation of a device to increase scrubber				
:or)/(Capital Costs-Avoided Costs) = uel = (Decreased Heat				removal efficiency. The device eliminates the "sneakage" of flue gas around the module walls thus improving removal efficiency.				
ised Net Load)(Equiv.Hrs)/(Coal)0 Lbs/Ton) = (Tons)				Note 6 - Capital cost includes an extra \$200,000 for minor modifications to main transformer and isophase duct to handle increased load.				
				Note 7 - For this economic analysis, moderate NOx reduction technology is assumed to be Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) because it is well proven. Other technologies such as ultra-low NOx burners will be evaluated before the final decision is made.				